REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-10 remain pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the claimed subject matter.

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Rhapsody-4.1. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons discussed in the previous amendment filed October 1, 2010, for example, Rhapsody-4.1 does not mentions the terms "requirements", "constraint" and "traceability," which are clearly in claim 1.

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Office's position for at least the reasons discussed in the previous amendment, amendments to claim 1 have nevertheless been made solely for the purpose of expediting prosecution.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied art does not disclose the claimed feature of claim 1, e.g.,

> "using a «constraint» option therein for attaching a requirement immediately on a common the created UML element in said graphics interface and that contains a set of elements, and on which the requirement has repercussions, in the graphics interface and wherein the element is systematically filled filling in with an the upward requirement which has given rise to a creation the creation of the element."

According to the Office's position, Rhapsody-4.1 discloses the claimed step of using a «constraint» option in claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that, in Rhapsody reference, the "Hello World" sentence is not at all a requirement (or constraint) but merely an implementation of a feature: the title of page E1-12, where "hello" appears, is "Adding some code." Further, Rhapsody-4.1 discloses how to implement the name of the project (see page E1-7 of Rhapsody-4.1). Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the applied art and the rejection should be withdrawn.

4

Claims 3, 4 and 7 are patentable over the applied art at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claims 5,6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhapsody-4.1 in view of Kobryn. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Rhapsody-4.1 and Kobryn. Specifically, it is noted that the Office's assertion that Rhapsody-4.1 explicitly teaches navigate to DOORS to perform other operations... As a matter of fact, "navigate to DOORS" can be only seen in sheets E1-11, E1-21 and E1-24 of Rhapsody-4.1, but this option is even not explained anywhere in Rhapsody-4.1. In addition, it should be noted that this option appears, among several other options, in the context of "display features" which has nothing to do with the traceability of requirements. So, there is no "teaching" at all about operations that DOORS could perform.

On the other hand, DOORS is a requirement management tool, however, it is different from that in the claimed subject matter. In claim 1, the requirement is in combination with an UML modeling tool for providing a traceability of requirements. In Rhapsody-4.1, since "navigate to DOORS" is only mentioned "by the way." As mentioned above, Rhapsody-4.1 does not mention anywhere the words "requirement" or "constraint" or "traceability". Although Kobryn's DOORS overview mentions requirements and traceability, Kobryn does not forecast at all, upon the creation of a model element, to simultaneously attach a constraint to the thus created element and to attach corresponding information to the upward requirement from which this element creation originated.

Moreover, as disclosed in Fig. 2 of the present application, which support the amended claim 1, it is clear that attaching a constraint through the sequential use of "add new" menu and "constraint" sub-menu (or option). Such steps are even not suggested in the cited references: Kobryn even does not show a "add new" menu, whereas Rhapsody 4.1 shows the "add new" menu, but the corresponding sub-menu does not comprise the "constraint" option thereof.

5

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the applied art and the rejected dependent claims are patentable over the applied art of record for the reasons advanced with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

All rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Kenneth M. Berner/

Kenneth M. Berner
Registration No. 37,093

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: May 3, 2011
KMB/CY/ser

6